

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/559,347	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Kevin M Bernatz	Art Unit 1773	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kevin M Bernatz. (3)_____.

(2) Raj Dave. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 8/5/ and 8/6/02 .

Type: a)☒ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference
c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: all .

Identification of prior art discussed: Ross et al. .

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☒ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i)☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: applicants requested whether amendment to limit the NiNb layer to 200 - 400 Angstrom would be sufficient to show unexpected results over the prior art. The examiner indicated that the current data included many additional layers (CrMo, magnetic, protective, etc) deposited above the NiNb layer and that these layers would inherently contribute to the ion migration. The examiner did note that the prior art teaching reference used a 0.5 micron layer and that a declaration showing that the 200 - 400 Angstrom NiNb layer prevented the ion migration in and of itself would be sufficient to show patentability with just the 200 - 400 Angstrom limitation..